

## REMARKS

Claims 1-41 are pending in this Application, with claims 21-37 having been previously withdrawn. Claims 1-4, 18-20, and 38-40 have been amended. The Examiner's objections and rejections will now be respectfully addressed in turn.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1-20 and 38-41 have been rejected for being indefinite. In Response, Applicant respectfully amends claims 1-4, 18-20, and 38-40 as shown in the above listing.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 8-9, 14, and 38-40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by European Patent Number 0,587,247 to Fray ("Fray" hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant's amended claims 1 and 38 recite, *inter alia*,

"simultaneously supplying an electrical signal to first and second points in the dielectric resonator antenna, with a phase difference between said first and second points, such that the first point couples to a desired mode of the dielectric resonator antenna and the second point couples to the desired mode of the dielectric resonator antenna."

Fray does not teach first and second points in the dielectric resonator antenna. In fact, Fray does not teach a dielectric resonator antenna at all. Instead, the points 8 and 8a referred to by the Examiner are taught in Fray to be feeds to different locations on a patch antenna (please see Figure 4 and column 5, lines 20-26). Applicant further and respectfully notes that even if, *pro arguendo*, the feeds 8 and 8a of Fray could be regarded as feeds to a dielectric resonator in the form of the coupling block 9, these two feeds 8 and 8a would then in fact feed into the dielectric resonator at the same point (i.e. the position at which the patch antenna is in contact with the dielectric resonator coupling block), rather than at the different points required by Applicant's claim 1.

In addition, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the first and second points are coupled to the *same* desired mode of the antenna (the first point couples to *a* desired mode of the dielectric resonator antenna and the second point couples to *the* desired mode of the dielectric resonator antenna, meaning that there is a single or same desired mode recited). Fray contains no teaching indicative of this amended element.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that Fray does not teach every element of Applicant's claims 1 or 38, or claims 8-9, 14, and 39-40 that depend respectively therefrom. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Fray does not anticipate Applicant's claims 1, 8-9, 14, and 39-40.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 5, 8-9, and 38-40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Publication Number 2003/0043075 to Bit-Babik ("Bit-Babik" hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant's amended claims 1 and 38 recite, *inter alia*,  
"simultaneously supplying an electrical signal to first and second points in the dielectric resonator antenna, with a phase difference between said first and second points, such that the first point couples to a desired mode of the dielectric resonator antenna and the second point couples to the desired mode of the dielectric resonator antenna."

Bit-Babik does not teach first and second points are coupled to the *same* desired mode of the antenna as recited by Applicant's claims 1 and 38 (the first point couples to *a* desired mode of the dielectric resonator antenna and the second point couples to *the* desired mode of the dielectric resonator antenna, meaning that there is a single or same desired mode recited). Instead, referring to Figures 5 and 6 and paragraphs 0068, 0071, and 0072, Bit-Babik teaches a feeding of a dielectric resonator such that of two or more modes are excited. Thus, the first and second points are not coupled to the same desired mode.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that Bit-Babik does not teach every element of Applicant's claims 1 or 38, or claims 5, 8-9, and 39-40 that depend respectively therefrom. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Bit-Babik does not anticipate Applicant's claims 1, 5, 8-9, and 39-40.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Bit-Babik in view of United States Publication Number 2001/0054978 to Adachi ("Adachi" hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1. Thus for at least the reasons set forth in the 102 remarks above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Bit-Babik does not teach every element of Applicant's claims Bit-Babik. As Adachi does not remedy the deficiencies of Bit-Babik, Applicant further asserts that any proposed combination of Bit-Babik and Adachi does not teach every element of Applicant's claims 2-4. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-4 are not obvious over any proposed combination of Bit-Babik and Adachi.

Claims 6-7, 10-13, and 15-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Bit-Babik. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 6-7, 10-13, and 15-20 depend from claim 1. Thus for at least the reasons set forth in the 102 remarks above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Bit-Babik does not teach every element of Applicant's claims Bit-Babik. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6-7, 10-13, and 15-20 are not obvious over Bit-Babik.

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Bit-Babik in view of United States Patent Number 4,201,958 to Kienberger ("Kienberger" hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 14 depends from claim 1. Thus for at least the reasons set forth in the 102 remarks above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Bit-Babik does not teach every element of Applicant's claims Bit-Babik. As Kienberger does not remedy the deficiencies of Bit-Babik, Applicant further asserts that any proposed combination of Bit-Babik and Kienberger does not teach every element of Applicant's claim 14. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 is not obvious over any proposed combination of Bit-Babik and Kienberger.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all of the outstanding rejections have been addressed herein and are now overcome. Entry and consideration hereof and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicant hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §§1.136, 1.137 for any extensions of time necessary for entry and consideration of the present Response.

If there are any charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

The Office is invited to contact applicant's attorneys at the below-listed telephone number concerning this Amendment or otherwise regarding the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By 

Daniel R. Gibson  
Registration Number 56,539  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
20 Church Street  
22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Hartford, CT 06103  
Telephone: 860-286-2929  
Facsimile: 860-286-0115  
Customer No. 23413

Date: March 5, 2008